DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 197 EC 302 924

AUTHOR Pounders, Mickey
TITLE Implementation of the Louisiana ADD Law.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attention Deficit Disorders; Compliance (Legal); Demonstration Programs; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Formative Evaluation; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Materials; *Program Development; *State Departments of Education; State Programs; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Louisiana

ABSTRACT

Louisiana's state education agency (SEA) was mandated to provide appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders, by developing statewide training for representatives from public school districts and by selecting and implementing four pilot programs. The SEA implemented the pilot programs, provided an informational training conference, and developed a program guidance manual. A formative evaluation of the SEA's efforts, based on document analysis and a survey of conference attendees, revealed that the SEA staff had done a good job in overseeing the project and providing technical assistance to local education authorities. Appendixes make up the bulk of the report and provide: a copy of the authorizing legislation; a rating scale used to evaluate the project; a copy of the Request for Proposals developed to solicit pilot program applications; descriptions of the four pilot programs selected for funding; a conference agenda and conference evaluation form; and other survey forms and evaluative data. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 369 197

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LOUISIANA ADD LAW

Mickey Pounders

Louisiana State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mickey Pounders

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 302934

Executive Summary

During the 1992 regular session of the Louisiana legislature, a bill was passed that required the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Department of Education (SEA) to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders. The bill also contained provisions that directed the SEA to provide statewide training for representatives from public school districts and to select and implement four pilot programs for the 92-93 school year. Each of these activities were to address the needs of students with identified attention deficit disorders.

SEA personnel began the task of establishing program criteria and appointed a proposal review committee. Requests for proposals were sent to every district in the state. Four pilot programs were selected and the SEA personnel turned their attention to organizing a statewide informational conference. A guidance manual was also in the process of being developed.

Total funding for the project was set by the legislature at $97,000. Each selected district was allotted $15,000 with the balance retained for use at the state level.

The four pilot projects were approved before evaluation procedures were established. Due to constraints of time and resources, this evaluation deals only with state-level activities. This evaluation was formative in nature and served as an implementation study, focussing on the activities, services, materials, staffing, and administrative arrangements of the project.

Data were collected by document analysis and surveys of program participants. Each program activity was examined to determine the degree of implementation and/or accomplishment.

The SEA was able to provide an informational training conference and a program guidance manual. Both of these features were highly rated among participants. The SEA also selected and implemented four pilot projects, each attempting to meet the needs of ADD/ADHD children in slightly different manners.

SEA personnel continued to monitor and support these projects through correspondence and technical assistance. Interim reports were gathered and financial records were maintained.

Areas of concern centered around the scope of this evaluation, with a realization that each of the pilot projects deserved evaluation as well. A lack of continued funding may limit the opportunities of other districts to participate in this area of staff development in a meaningful way. The survey instruments used to evaluate the conference and the guidance manual may not yield reliable information.

Any opportunity to raise the awareness of educators to specific problems faced by school children should be appreciated. With current interest and concern focussed on ADD/ADHD, this project was timely and appropriate. The participation of educators from across the state has planted seeds of information and knowledge that will grow into networks of increased understanding and desire to more adequately meet the needs of all children.

Background Information

Awareness of and concern for ADD/ADHD students is currently high in this country. The complex nature of this disorder or combination of disorders has caused many individuals and groups to consider how best to meet the needs of students affected. The Texas Education Agency (1992) has recommended six strategies for serving these students and adults who work with them.

1. Instruction that modifies and clarifies student assignments.
2. Consultation services for classroom teachers.
3. Professional support for children.
4. Ongoing evaluation of the child's needs.
5. Services to help the child's family.
6. Access to other support programs.

These strategies are quite similar to the interventions suggested within the pilot projects approved by the Louisiana Department of Education. Another commonality is the suggestion for six hours of training for teachers in identification and instructional strategies.

Pond and Gilbert (1987) pioneered a project that provided a support group for parents of ADD/ADHD children. At the time it was a relatively new treatment dimension and parents who participated indicated that the sessions more than met their expectations. The study suggested that such programs be continued, that ongoing parent groups be established, and that similar programs for teachers, school nurses, and others interested be offered.

Recent concerns have been raised (Adesman & Wender, 1991) that often students diagnosed with ADD/ADHD are actually affected by other conditions. Hearing loss, impaired vision, depression, and anxiety all produce symptoms that are similar to ADD/ADHD. Proper diagnosis through professional evaluation is the key to identifying the true need and thus providing the proper service. Adesman and Wender also indicate that boys are more likely to develop ADD/ADHD. The ratio of boys to girls in classification ranges from 3 to 1 to 9 to 1.

Mattison, Morales, and Bauer (1992) also stress the importance of early diagnosis and intervention in order to prevent many boys from deteriorating to a level of dysfunction that may require SED placement. They also call for uniform terminology, definition, eligibility criteria, and data collection procedures.

As early as 1981, physicians were urged to integrate their treatments with input from educators (Lerner & Cohn, 1981). The need for a common terminology and better communication was also realized and the term attentional deficit disorder was suggested.

These factors and concerns serve to legitimize Louisiana's ADD law and underscore the importance of the efforts of health care

professionals and educators to meet the needs of a growing number of this country's youth. Current estimates indicate that from two to five percent of all elementary school students meet the diagnostic criteria for ADD or ADHD (Texas Education Agency, 1992).

Program History

During the 1992 regular session of the Louisiana legislature, a bill was passed that required the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Department of Education (SEA) to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders (Appendix A).

Prior to appropriation and final passage of the bill, the SEA was contacted regarding a funding statement. The bureau director was told that the bill would generate approximately $400,000 and that eight pilot projects would be funded. Preliminary plans were made for disseminating requests for proposals.

In its final form, the bill contained provisions that directed the SEA to provide statewide training of representatives from public school districts and to select and implement four pilot programs for the 92-93 school year. Each of these activities were to address the needs of students with identified attention deficit disorders. Total funding for the project was set at $97,000.

SEA personnel began their oversight by establishing the selection criteria for the pilot projects (Appendix B), issuing a request for proposals (Appendix C), and establishing a proposal review committee.

Eight proposals were submitted and after review, the committee recommended four for implementation as pilot projects (Appendix D). Each selected district was allotted $15,000 with the balance of funding retained for use at the state level.

In early February, 1993, SEA personnel were approached about the possibility of allowing a university doctoral student to assist in the actual evaluation of the project. Even though six percent of the total program funding was allocated to the SEA for evaluation and oversight, plans had not been finalized regarding an evaluation of the project and the doctoral student was warmly welcomed into the process.

The statewide conference and publication of the guidance manual had consumed most of the SEA's allocation. Bureau staff viewed this project as one that had been given to them without their input, resulting in feelings of ambivalence. Staff members expressed support for and agreement with the need for such a program, but were disappointed that full funding had not been forthcoming and that an allocation for a program manager had not been provided.

Two other concerns regarding this project were its origin and the possibility of continued funding. Rather than being generated by BESE or the SEA, this law began in the legislature and was forwarded to these two state entities for implementation. The legislation contained no language regarding continued funding and most individuals involved assumed that this would be a one year project.

Project Funding

The legislature allocated $97,000 for all of the program activities. Six percent could be retained by the SEA for evaluation and supervision. Each of the four pilot projects received $15,000.

Budgeted amounts and expenditures for state-level activities are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

CATEGORY	BUDGET	EXPENDITURES
Travel	3,500.00	72.68
Printing (Manual)	5,000.00	5,672.20
Rental	1,500.00	00.00
Food	8,132.00	7,568.40
Prof. Services	13,500.00	12,320.54
Aid to LEA's	60,000.00	59,594.00
Evaluation	2,500.00	00.00
Printing & Postage	2,568.00	352.35
Office Supplies	300.00	96.65
	97,000.00	85,676.82

Approximately $11,000 remained unspent at the close of the project year. The bookkeeper who handles this project's transactions stated that it was not unusual to carry over this amount. There may still be a few unpaid bills remaining in the project and there may be activities that the SEA may want to carry out. Such activities might include printing more of the Guidance Manuals, meeting with the four program managers for a review session, or providing a follow-up training session.

SEA records were accurate in regard to expenditures within the pilot projects and at the state level. Receipts and authorizations were attached to every payment voucher. The tables below indicate the budgeted amounts and the expenditures for each of the pilot projects.

Calcasieu Parish

CATEGORY	BUDGET	EXPENDITURES
Stipends	2,400.00	2,400.00
Materials	6,510.00	6,395.10
Prof. Services	6,090.00	6,090.00
	15,000.00	14,885.10

Lafayette Parish

CATEGORY	BUDGET	EXPENDITURES
Consultant Fees	600.00	500.00
Stipends	5,880.00	5,488.00
Materials	7,732.84	7,971.90
Equipment	756.54	756.54
	14,969.38	14,716.44

St. Tammany Parish

CATEGORY	BUDGET	EXPENDITURES
Stipends	3,328.00	3,328.00
Substitute Te. Pay	4,682.00	4,682.00
Supplies	480.00	472.46
Prof. Services	6,510.00	6,510.00
	15,000.00	14,992.46

Tangipahoa Parish

CATEGORY	BUDGET	EXPENDITURES
Materials	11,892.21	11,892.21
Consultant Fees	600.00	600.00
Substitute Te. Pay	2,143.95	2,143.95
Travel	363.84	363.84
	15,000.00	15,000.00

Personnel Involved

Those directly responsible for implementation and oversight of this project were the Bureau of Elementary Education Director and one Program Manager. The evaluator met with these individuals regularly and all three agreed on program goals, evaluation goals, and evaluation procedures.

Program managers at each of the district sites were responsible for disseminating information within districts and for forwarding any program changes as well as the annual report to the SEA.

State-Level Activities

State-level activities were to include a statewide informational awareness conference designed to accommodate four individuals from every district both public and non-public, the development of an implementation Guidance Manual, and the identification of the pilot projects. These activities were consistent with and followed the parameters of the legislation. Legislative purpose can be summarized in the following two elements.

1. To require the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders.

2. To provide for duties and responsibilities of the State Department of Education regarding training and pilot programs.

Evaluable Model

This evaluation was formative in nature and served as an implementation study. As stated in the Evaluator's Handbook (Herman, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987), such an evaluation should focus on the activities, services, materials, staffing, and administrative arrangements that compose a program. This study examined these elements within the State Department of Education.

Wholey's model as described by Rutman (1977) served as a framework to assess the evaluability of this project. The stated legislative purpose was to require the BESE to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders and to provide for duties and responsibilities of the SEA regarding training and pilot programs. These purposes were easily translated into the goals and activities of an evaluable model.

Goal I: To provide guidance to school boards for delivering appropriate educational services for public school students with identified attention deficit disorders, including procedures for the building level committee to follow when a request is received concerning a student who is suspected of having an attention deficit disorder.

Activity I.1: Statewide training of representatives from public and non-public schools.

Activity I.2: Develop and disseminate a handbook dealing with identification procedures, identifying characteristics, assessment techniques, and modifications/accommodations.

Goal II: Implement four pilot programs for students with attention deficit disorders.

Activity II.1: Design selection criteria for pilot programs.

Activity II.2: Send request for proposals to every district.

Activity II.3: Establish a proposal review committee.

Activity II.4: Select four pilot programs/sites.

Activity II.5: Disperse funds and monitor progress of pilot programs.

Evaluation sources came from the following three areas.

1. Document analysis: request for proposals, selection criteria, review committee members, program proposals, expenditures, receipts, conference program, and ADD/ADHD Guidance Manual.

2. Participant evaluations of ADD/ADHD conference: evaluations completed by all attendees and evaluations completed by those participating in the Administrative Leadership Academy.

3. Evaluation of ADD/ADHD Guidance Manual: one completed for each school district.

Methodology

The following alignments indicate the methods, procedures, and/or instruments that were used to measure the effectiveness, degree of implementation, and/or perceptions of the activities and individuals within the program.

Evaluation Activity I.1: Document analysis was conducted, focussing on the Conference Agenda (Appendix E), Conference Evaluation Form (Appendix F) completed by all attendees, and the Conference Evaluation Form (Appendix G) completed by all attendees who were also participating in the Administrative Leadership Academy. Means and frequencies were considered along with written comments provided.

Evaluation Activity I.2: Document analysis was conducted using the Guidance Manual Evaluation Form (Appendix H) which was sent to every district in the state. Means and frequencies were

considered along with written comments provided and actual examination of the Guidance Manual.

Evaluation Activity II.1: Document analysis of selection criteria was conducted.

Evaluation Activity II.2: Document analysis of request for proposals was conducted.

Evaluation Activity II.3: Document analysis of membership and meetings of the proposal review committee was conducted.

Evaluation Activity II.4: Document analysis of program selection and notification and correspondence during the program year was conducted.

Evaluation Activity II.5: Document analysis of program expenditures by requests for reimbursement and receipts was conducted.

Evaluative Response

Activity I.1: A two-day training session was provided and each public and non-public school was invited to send at least four representatives. A conference evaluation form was completed by 171 participants (see tally sheet following Appendix F). Six of the seven workshop components rated were considered excellent or almost excellent by more than 90% of the respondents. The other workshop component was rated excellent or almost excellent by 89.5% of the respondents.

A second evaluation form was completed by conference attendees who were also participating in the Administrative Leadership Academy. The conference ratings on this instrument were as high or higher than the first (see tally sheet following Appendix G).

Written comments were primarily positive with several respondents expressing a desire for more in depth information and training in certain areas.

The evaluator attended both days of the conference and would agree that the quality of presentation and relevance of material were both outstanding. This objective was fully accomplished.

Activity I.2: After reading the handbook, the evaluator considers it an outstanding contribution to the schools of this state. One book for each school building was made available to every district during the conference. A follow-up survey was sent to every district in the state for the purpose of gathering feedback regarding the Guidance Manual itself and each district's progress in implementing the ADD law (see the tally sheet following Appendix H).

From the state's 66 school districts, 46 surveys were returned (70%). Three questions dealt with the Guidance Manual itself and the other four questions referred to awareness and implementation. The organization of the manual and its quality were considered good or excellent by 91.3% of the respondents. The classroom strategies were rated good or excellent by 86.9% of the respondents.

The questions dealing with awareness and implementation were either evenly split or heavy on the poor to fair end. The level of local awareness and the degree to which provisions have been made for assessment were both evenly split. Fifty percent of the respondents rated these two components poor to fair and 50% rated them good to excellent. The degree to which personnel have outlined their duties was rated poor to fair by 54.3% of the respondents. The degree to which provisions have been made for remediation was rated poor to fair by 54.4% of the respondents.

It is very likely that the main focus of ADD/ADHD efforts during the program year, with the exception of the four pilot projects, remained close to central offices and pupil appraisal groups. Many respondents indicated that teacher inservice and additional training would begin in the fall of 1993.

Based on the numbers offered by the guidance manual survey, over 7,000 teachers have been made aware that a guidance manual exists in regard to ADD/ADHD. Over 1,000 administrators have also been informed as to the manual's existence. If these numbers are accurate, an impact has been made on the consciousness of educators in Louisiana. Beginning with knowledge of the condition, educators have an opportunity to sharpen their skills in providing instruction and assistance that will address the needs of all students.

This activity has ben accomplished through the development and dissemination of the handbook.

Activity II.1: SEA staff and other educators designed the selection criteria and accomplished this activity.

Activity II.2: Requests for proposals were sent to every district in the state.

Activity II.3: A proposal review committee was established and did meet to consider each proposal submitted.

Activity II.4: Four pilot programs were selected.

Activity II.5: LEA program managers were notified of their selection and program implementation began. SEA staff monitored progress by collecting interim reports and reviewing budget modifications and requests for reimbursement.

Limitations and Problems

There are three major limitations to this evaluation study. First, the four pilot projects were selected and approved before evaluation procedures were established. Each district selected its own sources of data to be used in program evaluation. There was little continuity between the programs as the chart (Appendix I) details.

Due to constraints of time and resources, this evaluation focussed only on state-level activities. A more thorough examination of each pilot project might have revealed activities appropriate for students statewide. It is suggested that such an evaluation be conducted as phase two of this project.

The survey instruments used to evaluate the workshop training session and the guidance manual are very limited in scope and are inherently positive in the way they are administered. These instruments were approved by SEA personnel because they were similar to those used in the past and there was a desire for consistency. Rating surveys administered at the close of a session may elicit a more positive response than the participants truly feel.

Conclusions

The SEA staff has done a good job in overseeing this project and providing technical assistance to the LEA's. Correspondence has been positive and helpful. Several letters were noted, thanking the SEA staff for their prompt handling of requests for funding adjustments and budget changes.

The informational and awareness conference was well done and provided much information to many educators in a short period of time. The guidance manual was well written and copies have been made available to every school building in the state. Awareness of ADD/ADHD and the needs of these children will benefit all students as teachers begin to modify their instructional strategies .

It is unfortunate that funding for this project was not continued into a second year. Other school districts could have benefitted from additional resources and opportunities for inservice. Hopefully, the four pilot projects will continue on their own. With teachers trained and materials purchased, the goals of each project can still be pursued.

References

Adesman, A. R., & Wender, E. H. (1991, March). Improving the outcome for children with ADHD. Contemporary Pediatrics, pp. 122-139.

Herman, J. L., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). Evaluator's handbook. Newbury Park: Sage.

Lerner, J. W., & Cohn, S. L. (1981). Learning disabilities and the child-care physician. In W. M. Cruickshank & A. A. Silver (Eds.), Bridges to tomorrow (pp. 213-220). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Mattison, R. E., Morales, J., & Bauer, M. A. (1992). Distinguishing characteristics of elementary schoolboys recommended for SED placement. Behavioral Disorders, 17, 107-114.

Pond, E. F., & Gilbert, C. M. (1987). A support group offers help for parents of hyperactive children. Children Today, 16, 23-26.

Rutman, L. (1977). Evaluation research methods: A basic guide. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Texas Education Agency. (1992). Assessing and serving children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: A report to the Seventy-Second Texas Legislature and a memorandum from the United States Department of Education. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 686)

Appendix A

LEGISLATIVE ACTION FORM

1992 REGULAR SESSION OF THE LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE

BILL OR RESOLUTION NO.: SB 769 AUTHOR: Cox

ACT NO.: _____

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF BILL OR RESOLUTION/REQUIREMENTS, REPORTS, AND DATES:

Relative to duties, functions and responsibilities of the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education; to require the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders; to provide for duties and responsibilities of the state Department of Education, and to provide for training and pilot programs.

OFFICE: Academic Pgms/Spec. Ed. BUREAU: Elementary Education

CONTACT PERSON: Mary L. Jones TELEPHONE: 504-342-3366

PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION BY YOUR OFFICE	DATE ACTION TAKEN/ PROPOSED DATE FOR ACTION
1. Design selection criteria for pilot programs.	July, 1992
2. Design the Request for proposals	July, 1992
3. Mail out Request for Proposals.	July, 1992
4. Receive Request for Proposals.	August, 1992
5. Read review and select pilot sites. (One per Congressional District)	August, 1992
6. Approval of pilot sites by B.E.S.E.	September, 1992
7. Notification to LEA's of selected pilot sites.	September, 1992
8. Implementation of pilot sites	September, 1992
9. Statewide training for LEA's on characteristics, strategies, accomodations and assessment techniques regarding instruction of children with ADD.	February, 1993
10. Evaluation of pilot programs.	June, 1993

SIGNATURE OF DEPUTY/ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENROLLED

Regular Session, 1992

SENATE BILL NO. 769

BY SENATORS COX, PICARD, BRINKHAUS, HINTON, BANKSTON, FIELDS AND SEVARIO, AND REPRESENTATIVES CARRIER, CURTIS, DOERGE, HILL, LONG, MCCALLUM, AND MCDONALD

AN ACT

To enact R.S. 17:7(15), relative to the duties, functions and responsibilities of the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education; to require the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders; to provide for duties and responsibilities of the state Department of Education; to provide for training and pilot programs; to provide for funding; and to provide for related matters.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana:

Section 1. R.S. 17:7(15) is hereby enacted to read as follows:

§7. Duties, functions, and responsibilities of board

In addition to the authorities granted by R.S. 17:6 and any other powers, duties, and responsibilities vested by any other applicable laws, the board shall:

* * *

(15)(a) Provide guidance to city and parish school boards for delivering appropriate educational services for public school students with identified attention deficit disorders. Any such guidance shall be in accordance with the procedures and requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and subsequent amendments, and shall include procedures for the school building level committee to follow when a request is received from a parent, student, school nurse, classroom teacher, or other school personnel concerning a student who is suspected of or regarded as having an attention deficit disorder.

(b) Students receiving services under the provisions of this Paragraph shall be those students who do not qualify for special educational services under categories such as learning disabled, behavior disordered, and other health impaired, as defined in Bulletin 1508, the Pupil Appraisal Handbook.

(c) The state Department of Education shall provide for:

(i) Statewide training of representatives from public city and parish school

S 209

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

systems on meeting the needs of students with attention deficit disorders. Such training shall include identifying characteristics associated with attention deficit disorders, assessment techniques, and developing appropriate accommodations and modifications in home, school, and social environments.

(ii) A request for proposals to be issued to public city and parish school systems no later than August 1, 1992, for four pilot programs for students with attention deficit disorders. The pilot programs shall be selected based on criteria to be established by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and shall include, but not be limited to geographic location, size of the school population, and the existence of established programs for students with attention deficit disorders in local school systems. The pilot program shall begin in the 1992-93 school year and shall be evaluated at the conclusion of such school year for effectiveness in meeting the needs of the students with attention deficit disorders.

(d) The funding for the statewide training program and the four pilot programs shall not exceed a total of ninety-seven thousand dollars. Funds not to exceed six percent of the total program funding shall be allocated to the state Department of Education for evaluation and oversight of the pilot programs.

Section 2. This Act shall become effective upon signature by the governor or, if not signed by the governor, upon expiration of the time for bills to become law without signature by the governor, as provided by Article III, Section 18 of the Constitution of Louisiana.

_____
PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE

_____
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

_____
GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

APPROVED:_____

S 209

ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER (ADD)
PROJECT REVIEW RATING SCALE

LEA _____ SCHOOL _____

REVIEWER'S NAME _____

Instruction to Reviewers:

1. Read and rate the applicant's response to each component by circling the appropriate number (1=inadequate to 5=excellent). The ratings you assign reflect your evaluation of how well the applicant addressed the required components and your evaluation of the quality of each required component.

2. Total the component ratings and record the overall score in the blank provided.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Abstract..... _____ of 5

Did the applicant briefly and concisely describe the purpose of the project and summarize the project goals?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

B. Statement of Need..... _____ of 10

Did the applicant describe the major need or problem to be addressed by the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Did the applicant provide evidence that supports the statement of need and that emphasizes the specific needs of the participants and/or students served by the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

C. Goals and Objectives..... _____ of 10

Did the applicant describe the purpose of the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Did the applicant state specific, measurable goals and objectives related to the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

D. Description of Activities..... _____ of 15

Did the applicant specify the activities that will be undertaken to accomplish the goals and objectives of the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Did the applicant specify the number and type of participants, person(s) responsible, timelines, and needed resources for each activity?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Does the project provide for continuation after the completion of the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

E. Evaluation Plan..... _____ of 15

Did the applicant describe the expected results of each project goal and objective and the procedures to be used to determine the achievement of expected results?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Does the applicant's evaluative design include measurement strategies, timelines, and data collection procedures for each goal and objective?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Did the applicant address the project's potential for replication throughout the state?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

F. Budget....._____ of 15

Did the applicant submit a written narrative that reflects the total expenditures of the project?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Did the applicant explain how the program provides the maximum quality service to students on the most cost effective basis within the regular classroom placement?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Does the budget appear justified in relation to the project goals, objectives, and activities?

Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

OVERALL RATING: _____ of 70

COMMENTS:

Louisiana Department of Education
Office of Academic Programs
Bureau of Elementary Education

Request for Proposals (RFPs)
Programs and Services for Students with Attention Deficit Disorders (FY93)

Statement of Purpose:

Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) is a syndrome characterized by serious and persistent difficulties in the following three areas: attention span, impulse control, and hyperactivity (sometimes). There are two types of attention deficits: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Undifferentiated Attention Deficit Disorder.

Large numbers of students are being diagnosed as having attention deficits. It is conservatively estimated that three percent to five percent of our school-age population is affected by ADD.

Children with attention deficits often show considerable variation with respect to their cognitive strengths and weaknesses. Many children with attention deficits also have specific processing disorders and academic problems. The most common are dysfunctions with memory, motor skills, language strategy use, and social cognition. Over time, most children with attention deficits experience increasing academic frustration. Multiple patterns of underachievement emerge over time within a population of students with attention deficits.

According to the criteria in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (American Psychological Association, 1987), (3rd ed., rev.) students [to be diagnosed as ADHD], must display specific characteristics prior to the age of seven. The diagnostic manual offers a second category for children with disturbances in which the primary characteristic is significant inattentiveness without signs of hyperactivity. This condition is specifically described as Undifferentiated Attention Deficit Disorder.

The purpose of this RFP is to provide for the establishment or expansion of eight model projects throughout the state to develop innovative programs to address the needs of students with attention deficit disorders who do not qualify for special educational services.

Project Description:

The purpose of these grants is to establish or expand model programs that will provide for evaluation and direct services for students with attention deficit disorders. Proposals must outline and describe the Local Education Agency's (LEA's) plans to develop a model program.

The project description must consist of a narrative describing the proposed project and must use the format below. The information should be presented in the order listed. The narrative should be limited to the number of pages needed to convey the required information.

A. Abstract

The applicant shall briefly and concisely describe the purpose of the project as it relates to the purpose of the RFP; and should summarize the project objectives, activities and evaluation.

B. Statement of Need

The applicant must describe the need to be addressed in the project. The statement should provide evidence of the local need and the manner in which the need was determined.

If a program has been in existence within the school system, the applicant must describe the existing program and the need for expansion.

This section must also include an explanation of how the successful completion of this proposed project will correct or reduce the need as it currently exists.

C. Goals and Objectives

Specific goals and objectives related to the purpose of the project must be developed and stated in this section. Objectives must be written in measurable, operational terms. Objectives which must be addressed in the project include those related to student attention and on-task performance, regulation and control of impulsive behavior, moderation of activity level, and improvements in classroom structure and organization resulting in increased student academic achievement.

School systems may also develop additional objectives deemed appropriate to the project. These additional objectives may include but are not limited to those which

address teacher attitude, student attitude, parent-child relationships, parent-school relationships, and peer relationships. The objectives of the project must also focus on the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as they relate to ADD as the handicapping condition.

The objectives shall reflect current practices with reference to professional literature. Objectives should be limited to those which are attainable within the project's timeframe and the project's funding level.

D. Description of Activities

The applicant must describe specific activities that will be undertaken to accomplish the stated goals and objectives. The activities should specify the number of participants and the selection criteria. The activities should include a timeline for completion, person responsible and needed resources. The activities should provide for continuation after the completion of the project.

E. Evaluation Plan

The applicant must describe the expected results of this project and specify an evaluation plan that includes both formative and summative elements. The evaluation plan must address the objectives rather than just report on activities completed. The plan must include measurable data obtained from both quantifiable and observable methods. In addition, timeline and data collection procedures must be specified for attainment of the objectives within the 1992-93 school year. The evaluation plan must address the project's potential for replication at other sites throughout the state.

F. Budget

Each applicant must submit a budget summary and a supplementary narrative that reflect the total expenditures of the project. The narrative should explain how the program provides the maximum quality service to students on the most cost effective basis within the regular classroom placement.

Allowable Costs:

Allowable costs that may be budgeted under this grant include the following:

-- contracted services
-- stipends
-- substitute pay
-- in-state travel expenses
-- materials and supplies
-- equipment (must be itemized and justified)

All proposed expenditures must be justified in relation to the scope of the project objectives.

Project Funding:

4 at $15,000.

Funding for this project will be provided on a reimbursement basis. Projects will be limited to $30,000 per school system. All funds must be expended prior to June 30, 1993. A budget summary of all expenditures must be submitted to the Bureau of Elementary Education by June 30, 1993.

Eligible Applicants:

Local education agencies may apply for one grant for either system-level or school-level implementation. One grant will be awarded in each of the state's regional service center areas.

Criteria for Selection:

Priority will be given to programs that will provide the maximum quality service to students on the most cost effective basis in their current regular education placement. Projects will be evaluated using a review rating scale which addresses each of the required components of the RFP. A state selection committee will review each of the proposals submitted by the LEA. Pilot programs will be named based on the numerical ratings of the reviewers. Final award of these funds is contingent upon approval by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Requirements of Applying School Systems:

School systems will provide an interim report on the achievement of goals, objectives and activities by January 15, 1993, and a final report is due by July 15, 1993.

School systems must agree to allow observations by State Department of Education personnel, program evaluators, and other interested parties.

Contact Person:

Dr. Mary Louise Jones; Director, Bureau of Elementary Education; P.O. Box 94064; Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; Phone: (504) 342-3366.

APPLICATION MUST BE SUBMITTED TO:

Dr. Mary Louise Jones, Director
Bureau of Elementary Education
Louisiana Department of Education
P. O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9064

DEADLINE FOR THE APPLICATIONS IS SEPTEMBER 11, 1992.

Please send an original and four copies.

Louisiana Department of Education
Office of Academic Programs
Bureau Of Elementary Education

Appendix D

Request for Proposals
Programs and Services for Students
with Attention Deficit Disorders
FY 93

Act 306 of the 1992 Legislative session required the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide for appropriate services for children with attention deficit disorders; to provide for duties and responsibilities of the State Department of Education, and to provide for training and pilot programs.

As a result of this legislation, four pilot programs will be funded at $15,000 each. A request for proposals was mailed to all LEA's August 10, 1992. The following eight parishes submitted proposals for the Attention Deficit Disorder pilot programs: Webster, Lafayette, St. Tammany, Evangeline, Tangipahoa, Calcasieu, St. Landry, and Orleans. On September 17, 1992, these proposals were rated by a state selection committee using a review rating form.

The review committee recommends the following four projects for approval by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

I. **Lafayette Parish School System**

The program design is based on studies that have shown that the most effective approach to use with Attention Deficit Disorder(ADD) and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) students is a multi-modal one which addresses not only the medical needs of the student, but also the psychological, educational, and behavorial needs. " The ABC's of ADD" is designed to address these needs.

II. Calcasieu Parish School System

The project will focus on the classified and suspected ADD/ADHD students at Sam Houston High, Moss Bluff Middle, and Gillis Elementary schools. The goal of this project is to provide educators and parents in these four schools with the skills needed to identify ADD/ADHD students and to modify the home and school environment to help these students reach their full potential. In addition, the proposed project will give parents, students and teachers help by developing, implementing, evaluating, and refining for replication a model program that will train parents and teachers and provide for identification of and direct services for students with attention deficit disorders.

III. St. Tammany Parish School System

The goal of this project is to provide an appropriate educational program within regular education for those students with Attention Deficit Disorder who do not qualify for special education services according to criteria in Bulletin 1508. The project will provide for teacher training in the identification of the syndrome and intervention strategies; parent education and information; support groups for children; and resource information for teachers and parents.

IV. Tangipahoa Parish School System

The purpose of this grant is to establish a model program within the system to inform educators, secure identification materials, establish an assessment process, prescribe reasonable accommodations, accumulate data, and to follow-up on students identified as having ADD/ADHD. Identification of these students and intervention by a team of professionals trained in understanding ADD/ADHD is critical. This grant will be used for that purpose.

STATE COMMITTEE
FOR
ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER PROPOSAL REVIEW

1. Marguerite Adams, Program Manager
   Attention Deficit Disorder
   Parkland Hospital
   Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

2. Wanda Handy, Classroom Teacher
   Iberville Elementary School
   1430 Iron Farm Road
   Plaquemines, Louisiana 70764

3. Ms. Susan Falcon, Supervisor
   LeBlanc Special Services Center
   611 North Burnside
   Gonzales, Louisiana 70737

4. Dr. Clifford C. Ouder, Director
   Pupil Appraisal Center
   P. O. Drawer B
   Napoleonville, Louisiana 70390

5. Ms. Lora Patureau, Principal
   Walnut Hills Elementary School
   2040 South Acadian Thruway
   Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Louisiana Department of Education Staff

1. Billie Cunningham, Section Chief
   Office of Special Education
   Bureau of Pupil Appraisal and Support Services

2. Susan Johnson, Program Manager
   Office of Academic Programs
   Bureau of Elementary Education

3. Cynthia Lanier, Program Manager
   Office Of Academic Programs
   Bureau of Elementary Education

CONFERENCE ON ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDERS

Appendix E

BELLEMONT HOTEL

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1993

8:00 - 8:45	Registration
8:45 - 9:00	Welcome Dr. Raymond G. Arveson State Superintendent of Education Dr. Moselle A. Dearbone Assistant Superintendent of Academic Programs
9:00 - 10:30	Ronald Walker • **Overview and Definition of ADD and ADHD**
10:30 - 11:30	Michael J. Levine, M.D. Medical Director, Division of Mental Retardation/ Developmental Disabilities, State of Louisiana • **Overview of Specific Developmental Disorders/ Attention Deficit Disorder**
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 3:30	Ronald Walker • **Diagnosing ADD and ADHD** • **Legal Rights** • **Academic and Behavioral Problems of Students with ADD and ADHD**

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1993

8:00 - 8:30	Registration
8:30 - 11:30	Ronald Walker • **Behavioral and Academic Interventions for Students with ADD and ADHD**
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 3:00	Ronald Walker • **Behavioral and Academic Interventions for Students with ADD and ADHD**

Appendix F

EVALUATION FORM

INFORMATIONAL AWARENESS CONFERENCE
ON ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER
February 15 and 16, 1993

1. The organization of the workshop was:

Poor _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Excellent
1 2 3 4 5

2. The scope (coverage) of the workshop was:

Inadequate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Most Adequate
1 2 3 4 5

3. This workshop met my needs:

Not at all _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Exceptionally Well
1 2 3 4 5

4. Were the workshop activities and information relevant?

Inapplicable _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Most Applicable
1 2 3 4 5

5. How much of the content will you be able to apply?

None _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ All
1 2 3 4 5

6. The amount of time devoted to this topic was:

Insufficient _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Excellent
1 2 3 4 5

7. Overall, I consider this workshop:

Poor _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Excellent
1 2 3 4 5

EVALUATION FORM

INFORMATIONAL AWARENESS CONFERENCE
ON ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDER
FEBRUARY 15 AND 16, 1993

N = 171

1. The organization of the workshop was:

M = 4.65

Poor	1	%	2		3		4		5		Excellent
	1	.6	1	.6	4	2.3	45	26.3	120	70.2	

2. The scope (coverage) of the workshop was:

4.69

Inadequa	1	%	2		3		4		5		MostAde
					8	4.7	37	21.6	126	73.7	

3. This workshop met my needs:

4.5

Not At All	1	%	2		3		4		5		Exceptio
			1	.6	17	9.9	48	28.1	105	61.4	

4. Were the workshop activities and information relevant?

4.78

Inapplica	1	%	2		3		4		5		MostAppl
			1	.6	2	1.2	31	18.1	137	80.1	

5. How much of the content will you be able to apply?

4.54

None	1	%	2		3		4		5		All
			1	.6	10	5.8	56	32.7	104	60.8	

6. The amount of time devoted to this topic was:

4.52

Insufficie	1 %	2	3	4	5	Excellent
	1 .6	1 .6	9 5.3	57 33.3	103 60.2	

7. Overall, I consider this workshop:

4.71

Poor	1 %	2	3	4	5	Excellent
		1 .6	4 2.3	38 22.2	128 74.9	

Code ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
(1-6)

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

Appendix G

Professional Development Program Evaluation Form

Title of Program _____

Date(s)/Time(s) of Program _____

Sponsoring Organization _____

*Your Social Security Number ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
(7-15)

Your Present Position: (Check One)

___ Principal
___ Assistant Principal
___ Other Central Office Administrator
___ Other (Please Specify) _____
___ Superintendent
___ Assistant/Associate Superintendent
(16)

Directions: Please circle the letter to the right of each statement that best reflects your personal opinion about this professional development program approved by the Louisiana Administrative Leadership Academy. Use the following scale in recording your opinions.

P = POOR; F= FAIR; G = GOOD; E = EXCELLENT

1. The organization of this professional development program was..... P F G E (17)
2. Leader(s)/trainer(s) for this program were..... P F G E (18)
3. The quality of the facilities/accommodations where the program occurred was..... P F G E (19)
4. The pace of the program was..... P F G E (20)

   _____ Too Fast _____ Too Slow _____ About Right (Check One) (21)
5. The length of this program was..... P F G E (22)

   _____ Too Fast _____ Too Slow _____ About Right (Check One) (23)
6. The quality of training materials/handouts was..... P F G E (24)
7. The level of participation of school administrators in this program was..... P F G E (25)
8. Information shared among participating administrators was..... P F G E (26)

*Confidentiality of your responses to this evaluation form will be maintained. Your social security number must be entered correctly in order to complete requirements for receiving credits for this program through the Louisiana Administrative Leadership Academy.

9. The contribution of the program to the development of new ideas, insights and skills for participating administrators was..... P F G E (27)

10. The potential of the program for enhancing the educational effectiveness of my school or parish is..... P F G E (28)

11. The potential of the program for enhancing the educational climate of my school or parish is..... P F G E (29)

12. The contribution of the program to my personal professional development was..... P F G E (30)

13. The potential of the program to positively impact student achievement in my school of parish is..... P F G E (31)

14. The potential of the program to improve instruction in the classroom is..... P F G E (32)

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions by circling either YES, NO, or ? to the right of each question.

1. Considering your current role as a school administrator, was this program important for your continuing professional development..... YES NO ? (33)

2. If the opportunity was available, would you choose to participate in this kind of program again?..... YES NO ? (34)

3. Would you recommend participation in this program to other administrators?..... YES NO ? (35)

4. Were the professional development benefits you received from this program worth the time/effort required?..... YES NO ? (36)

5. Was this the kind of program that should continue to be approved for credit by the Administrative Leadership Academy?..... YES NO ? (37)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

In the space below, please provide any additional valuative comments you would like to make concerning this professional development program. Address the major strengths and weaknesses of the program such as the quality of various trainers/leaders, program content, activities, and etc.

CODE: 505006

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

Professional Development Program Evaluation Form

Title of Program INFORMATION AWARENESS ON ADD

Date(s)/Time(s) of Program 02/93

Sponsoring Organization ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

1% Principal

3% Assistant Principal

54% Other Central Office Administrator

29% Other

4% Superintendent

7% Assistant/Associate Superintendent

Poor = 1 Fair = 2 Good = 3 Excellent = 4	Poor	Fair	Good	Excel	Means
1. The organization of this professional development program was . .	1%	1%	26%	71%	3.7
2. Leader(s)/trainer(s) for this program were			19%	81%	3.8
3. The quality of the facilities/accommodations where the program occurred was	3%	18%	36%	43%	3.2
4. The pace of the program was . . . . . 2% TOO FAST 6% TOO SLOW 93% ABOUT RIGHT		5%	41%	55%	3.5
5. The length of this program was . . . . . 2% TOO LONG 0% TOO SHORT 98% ABOUT RIGHT		5%	41%	54%	3.5
6. The quality of training materials/handouts was	1%	6%	27%	66%	3.6
7. The level of participation of school administrators in this program was		12%	42%	46%	3.3
8. Information shared among participating administrators was	1%	6%	36%	57%	3.5

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

Poor = 1 Fair = 2 Good = 3 Excellent = 4	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Means
9. The contribution of the program to the development of new ideas, insights and skills for participating administrators was		1%	25%	73%	3.7
10. The potential of the program for enhancing the educational effectiveness of my school or parish is		6%	27%	67%	3.6
11. The potential of the program for enhancing the educational climate of my school or parish is	1%	6%	27%	66%	3.6
12. The contribution of the program to my personal professional development was		2%	29%	70%	3.7
13. The potential of the program to positively impact student achievement in my school or parish is	1%	4%	27%	67%	3.6
14. The potential of the program to improve instruction in the classroom is	1%	3%	28%	67%	3.6

	Yes	No	?
1. Considering your current role as a school administrator, was this program important for your continuing professional development?	100%		
2. If the opportunity was available, would you choose to participate in this kind of program again?	99%	1%	
3. Would you recommend participation in this program to other administrators?	100%		
4. Were the professional development benefits you received from this program worth the time/effort required?	99%	1%	
5. Was this the kind of program that should continue to be approved for credit by the Administrative Leadership Academy?	100%		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SURVEY TO ASCERTAIN EVALUATION DATA REGARDING THE GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LOUISIANA ADD LAW

Please rate each of the following:

1. The organization of the Guidance Manual--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

2. The quality of the Guidance Manual--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

3. The classroom strategies provided in the Guidance Manual--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

4. The level of local awareness regarding ADD/ADHD--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

5. The degree to which personnel have outlined their duties and responsibilities regarding ADD/ADHD students--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

6. The degree to which provisions have been made for the assessment of students suspected of having ADD/ADHD--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

7. The degree to which provisions have been made for the remediation of ADD/ADHD students--

   Poor Fair Good Excellent

Please answer the following:

1. Approximately how many teachers have been made aware of the Guidance Manual for Implementation of the Louisiana ADD Law?

   _____

2. Approximately how many administrators have been made aware of the Guidance Manual for Implementation of the Louisiana ADD Law?

   _____

Please Return by June 15, 1993: Department of Education, Bureau of Elementary Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9064

SURVEY TO ASCERTAIN EVALUATION DATA REGARDING THE GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LOUISIANA ADD LAW

N=46

1. The organization of the Guidance Manual--

M=3.22

#	Poor %	Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2.2	3	6.5	27	58.7	15	32.6

2. The quality of the Guidance Manual--

3.17

Poor	Fair		Good		Excellent	
0	4	8.7	30	65.2	12	26.1

3. The classroom strategies provided in the Guidance Manual--

3.26

Poor	Fair		Good		Excellent	
0	6	13.0	22	47.8	18	39.1

4. The level of local awareness regarding ADD/ADHD--

2.57

Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
2	4.3	21	45.7	18	39.1	5	10.9

5. The degree to which personnel have outlined their duties and responsibilities regarding ADD/ADHD students--

2.44

Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
6	13.0	19	41.3	16	34.8	5	10.9

6. The degree to which provisions have been made for the assessment of students suspected of having ADD/ADHD--

2.50

Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
3	6.5	20	43.5	20	43.5	3	6.5

7. The degree to which provisions have been made for the remediation of ADD/ADHD students--

2.44

Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
5	10.9	20	43.5	17	37.0	4	8.7

1. Approximately how many teachers have been made aware of the Guidance Manual for Implementation of the Louisiana ADD Law? 7,219 +

2. Approximately how many administrators have been made aware of the Guidance Manual for Implementation of the Louisiana ADD Law? 1,271 +

Appendix I

Sources of Data for Each District Chosen as a Pilot Project

	Calca.	Lafay.	St.Tam.	Tang.
Records of identified students	X			
Num. of students referred/classified	X		X	X
Inservice records	X		X	
Sign-in sheets/agendas	X			
Student achievement test scores	X			X
Records of student observation	X			
Student discipline records	X	X		X
Correspondence/memos	X		X	
Behavior tracking charts		X		
Documented classroom modifications		X		X
Teacher attitude/knowledge surveys		X	X	
Student report cards		X		X
Documented support groups			X	
Number of brochures distributed			X	
Parent surveys			X	
Student attendance records				X